



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/729,040	12/05/2003	Kai Desinger	3002	9336

7590 08/18/2005

Beck & Tysver, P.L.L.C.
Suite 100
2900 Thomas Avenue S.
Minneapolis, MN 55416

EXAMINER

VRETTAKOS, PETER J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3739

DATE MAILED: 08/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/729,040

Applicant(s)

DESINGER ET AL.

Examiner

Peter J. Vrettakos

Art Unit

3739

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/2004, 7/2005.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The application is a continuation of PCT/EP02/05778 filed 6-7-01.

Claims 1-19 are pending and addressed below. Claim 1 is lone independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 9 seems to be describing the embodiment in figure 13; however, no substantive description is found for this figure in the specification.

The Examiner reserves the right to impose an election of species for this alternate embodiment in a future action. Note: see the differences in the embodiment in figure 1b (corresponding to independent claim 1) and the wholly different embodiment in figure 13 (corresponding to dependent claim 9).

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2-4,6, 14, 15, 16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 2, 4,6, 14, neglect to positively recite **new structure** adding to the claimed device. These claims merely describe the invention (while neglecting to add new structure).

Claim 15 recites the limitation "insulator" and "insulator tube" in lines 3 and 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 16 recites the limitation "first hand portion" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 19 provides no nexus between the fluid and the probe. For example, is the fluid in a tube resting in the probe? This answer is partially answered only if the claim depended on claim 9.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Arndt et al. (6,134,476).

Arndt discloses a coaxial probe arrangement (700) in figure 7 with inner (710) and outer (706) conductors ("metal tubes") with annular insulation/tube (708) between and first (702, "tip") and second (716, "shaft") electrodes, as well as a hand portion (704 – "insulation jacket", handle, also see figure 5) with first and second blind bores (region D3 where 710 rests and the distal most area where 702 rests, respectively – also the first bore is inherently able to pass a "spring wire"). Region D1 and D2 includes transverse bores (in which 720 and 722 rest).

Design placement of inner conductor (710), which is metallic, inherently provides an increased flexural (bending) stiffness of the probe (700).

Arndt discloses saline (col. 23:19-23, *inter alia*), which can be of varying concentrations including those concentrations of lesser conductivity, anticipating claim 19.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arndt or Saab in view of Berube et al. (6,245,062).

There is no express mention of screws in Arndt or Saab.

Berube discloses an analogous microwave antenna in which the shaft (31) is screwed to the handle (38). See col. 11:40-45.

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Arndt or Saab in view of Berube by including as design expedients screws in a microwave antenna. The motivation would be to choose a design expedient that prevents the separate antenna parts from disassembling.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Edwards et al. (5,458,597), Eggers et al. (6,106,524).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J. Vrettakos whose telephone number is 571-272-4775. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda C. Dvorak can be reached on 571-272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3739

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Pete Vrettakos
August 13, 2005

PV

Roy D. Gibson
ROY D. GIBSON
PRIMARY EXAMINEE